#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and claim 12 was objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. By this current amendment claims 1-4, 6-7 and 9-13 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 5 and 8 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification and claims as filed. Claims 5 and 8 are pending in this application and are at issue. No new matter has been added by the present amendment.

The issues raised by the Examiner in the Office Action are summarized and addressed below.

#### **Information Disclosure Statement**

Enclosed herewith is an Information Disclosure Statement and form PTO/SB/08 compliant with provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609, referring to Serial No. 10/600,745. Applicants respectfully request that the reference be considered by the Examiner and placed of record in this case.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second paragraph

The rejection of claims 2, 3, and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been rendered moot by the cancellation thereof.

# Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First paragraph

Claims 1-11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the Examiner contended that the specification, while being enabling for methods of regeneration of the lens by dedifferentiating and transdefifferentiating cells using those agents recited by the specification, did not reasonably provide enabling for methods of regenerating any tissue or organ in

Application No. 10/600,745 Amendment dated September 1, 2006 Reply to Office Action of May 1, 2006

a mammalian subject. The Examiner contended that the specification did not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 1-4, 6-7 and 9-13 and the amendment of claims 5 and 8. Claim 5 is directed to regenerating a mammalian lens, the subject matter which the Examiner indicated was allowable.

4

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of 1-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

## Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The rejection of claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) has been rendered moot by the cancellation thereof.

# Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The rejection of claims 2 and 5-8 have been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 2 and 6, and the amendment of claims 5 and 8.

### **Claim Objections**

Claim 12 was objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. The Examiner stated that claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By the present amendment, claim 5 has been amended to add the limitation of claim 12 and is for a method of regenerating a mammalian lens. Claim 8 has been amended to depend from claim 5 and recite that guanosine is administered orally. Support for the amendment of claim 8 can be found in the instant specification on pages 18-22 (Example. 1).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the claims has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

5

Application No. 10/600,745 Amendment dated September 1, 2006 Reply to Office Action of May 1, 2006

## **CONCLUSION**

Claims 5 and 8 are in a condition for allowance.

In review of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this application and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 5 and 8 is earnestly solicited.

Dated: September 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Howard M. Frankfort

Registration No.: 32,613

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant